REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Brief Summary of Status

Claims 12-39 are pending in the application.

Claims 12-39 are rejected.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In response to the applicant's arguments, the examiner made an effort to write a very good Response to Arguments that has been helpful to the applicant in prosecuting the present application. The applicant appreciates the examiner's effort.

Based upon the examiner's response, the applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly emphasize differences that the applicant believes exists over the cited art and that the applicant believes to be patentable.

The applicant refers to FIG. 4A of the present application. The claim language previously referenced a two-part NAS system. The specific elements of the system of FIG. 4A have been inserted into the independent claims to more clearly distinguish those elements from the cited art.

The independent claims, as presently constituted, require:

a media storage module for storing media content;

a media protection module for protecting media content by, at least one, scrambling and encrypting the media content and for transmitting the protected media content over a local network;

a media processing module communicatively coupled to receive the protected media content over the local network to enable real-time playback of audiovisual programming stored on the NAS, the media processing module further including:

a decryption module for, at least one of, decrypting and descrambling the protected media content to produce unprotected media content;

a media content decoder for decoding the unprotected media content to produced decoded media content;

a display processor for generating output video based upon the decoded media content;

While the official action stated, for example, that Bonomi included a "two-part" system (as shown in FIG. 4A), the applicant notes that Bonomi does not teach:

1.   a media protection module
2.   a media processing module for transmitting the protected media over a local network (e.g., a home network)
3.   a decryption module
4.   a decoding module coupled to receive decrypted content from the decryption module
5.   a QoS module that transmits according to a determined QoS within the local or home network.

Regarding the teachings of Bonomi, Bonomi teaches (referring, for example to FIG. 3A, a video system that stores and transmits video to client machines by way of media delivery hardware. Bonomi does not teach items 3-5 above.

Tsao generally teaches a plurality of NAS Servers coupled to a multi-port switch or the equivalent for communicating content to a plurality of clients and a management controller for controlling such operations. Thus, Tsao does not add any teachings for items 3-5., above.

Accordingly, the action cites Brooks for teaching formatting and transmitting media in a protected manner, but only in general terms. More specifically, Brooks is cited for teaching that the data may be transmitted in a proprietary format because Brooks states in col. 6, lines 21-36, that alternative formats to MPEG1-MPEG4, such as ".avi" (Windows) or ".mov" (Quicktime) may be used. The applicant notes this is different from what the claims require. The claims require a "proprietary format" that only associated circuitry of the NAS delivery system can decode. The alternative formats cited in Brooks are commonly distributed formats are intended to be installed to process

video content. Such a teaching is opposite than what the applicants teach in relation to the term proprietary because the intent is to require a receiver with a module that access and processes the data. If the proprietary format was merely something that could be downloaded, the applicant's goal of protecting the video content would be defeated.

The applicant further notes that Verosub is cited for using content formats for protection. The applicant recognizes that Verosub teaches a digital rights management system that uses encryption and other logic to control access. Verrosub, in combination with the other cited references, however, does not teach that which the claims require as presently constituted.

As each of the independent claims is amended, the applicant believes that the grounds of rejection for the dependent claims as well as for the independent claims is moot based upon the claims as presently constituted.

The Applicant respectfully believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present U.S. utility patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON
/James A. Harrison/Reg. No. 40,401
James A. Harrison
Reg. No. 40,401

Dated: July 6, 2010

Garlick Harrison & Markison
P. O. Box 160727
Austin, TX 78716-0727
Phone: (214) 902-8100
Fax: (214) 902-8101